

## REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of claims 10 and 11.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Accordingly, Applicants amended claim 12 to clarify that the control voltage and the DC voltage are zero. Support for this amendment can be found on page 30, line 20 et seq. of Applicants' specification.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. More specifically, the Examiner objects to the "potential of the control voltage and the DC voltage" language in the claims. Accordingly, Applicants amended claim 12 as discussed above, and request withdrawal of the §112 rejection since claim 12 now clarifies that the control voltage and the DC voltage are zero.

Claims 1-3 and 8-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hasegawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,614,491). In response, Applicants amended independent claims 1 and 8 to recite that the electric field applied to the liquid crystal has an electric field strength of more than 5 V/ $\mu$ m, and respectfully traverse. Applicants traverse the rejection because the cited reference does not disclose or suggest an electric field strength, as now recited in the claims, which is directly applied to the liquid crystal and is greater than 5 V/ $\mu$ m.

The Examiner cites Hasegawa as teaching a DC voltage or offset voltage that is applied to a cell, and that is in the range of 0.2V to 10V (Col. 7, lns. 6-8). As noted by

Applicants in Amendment A filed February 3, 2005, Hasegawa only teaches an external electric field, but does not disclose the electric field strength directly applied to the liquid crystal. Nevertheless, the Examiner considers the electric field strength applied to the cell as equivalent to the electric field strength applied to the liquid crystal only. Therefore, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants amended independent claims 1 and 8 to clarify that the electric field strength is more than 5 V/ $\mu$ m. Accordingly, in light of this amendment and the Examiner's acknowledgement that Hasegawa does not teach or suggest an electrical field strength that is more than 5 V/ $\mu$ m, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa, and further in view of Wingen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,605,323) or Miura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,703,993). Applicants traverse the rejection for the reasons recited above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 1.

Since claims 4 and 7 depend upon claim 1, they necessarily include all of the features of their associated independent claim plus other additional features. Thus, Applicants submit that the §103 rejections of claims 4 and 7 have also been overcome for the same reasons mentioned above to overcome the rejection of independent claim 1, and also because the Wingen and Miura references fail to disclose or suggest an electric field strength of more than 5 V/ $\mu$ m that is directly applied to the liquid crystal. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejections of claims 4 and 7 also be withdrawn.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Jones (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,610). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Jones fails to disclose or suggest an electric field strength that is greater than 5 V/ $\mu$ m.


As noted by the Examiner in the Office Action, on page 8, Jones discloses an electric field strength from about 0.1 V/ $\mu$ m to about 5 V/ $\mu$ m. However, independent claim 1 now recites that the electric field strength must be greater than 5 V/ $\mu$ m, which excludes the electric field strength range recited by Jones. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §103 rejection of independent claim 1 and its respective depending claims 2-5.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

July 27, 2005  
300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978

By:   
Joseph P. Fox  
Registration No. 41,760